REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 14-18, 21-22, 26, 27, 36, 38, and 41-55 are pending in this application. Claims 11, 14, 17, 18, and 36 are amended, new Claims 41-55 is added, and Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 19, 20, 23-25, 28, 30-35, 37, 39, and 40 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment. As amended Claims 11, 14, 17, 18, and 36 and new Claims 41-55 are supported by the original disclosure,[1] no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-6, 10-12, 14-18, 21-28, 30-32, 34, 37, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nagayama (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2000-243558) in view of Iyama (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 09-138424); and Claims 7, 8, 19, 20, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama, and further in view of Codama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,114,805, hereinafter "Codama").

With regard to the rejections of Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 19, 23-25, 28, 30-35, 37, 39, and 40, these claims are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, making these rejections moot.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 11 recites in part:

> the supplementary wire comprises at least 3 layers including ***a first layer containing a Mo-Nb alloy*** as a surface layer, a second layer containing Al or an Al alloy formed below the surface layer, and ***a third layer below the second layer containing a Mo-Nb alloy, a content of Nb in the Mo-Nb alloy in the first layer and the third layer is between 10 and 20 atomic %***, and the second conductive layer is made of a same material as the driving current circuit connecting terminal.

[1]See, e.g., the original specification at page 18, lines 1-3, page 28, lines 1-7, and page 29, lines 15-16.

As noted in the present specification, the above configuration reduces resistance to moisture improving the anticorrosion properties of a Mo alloy electrode remarkably, improving the reliability of the display element.[2]

The outstanding Office Action conceded that neither Nagayama nor Iyama teach or suggest a layer including an Mo-Nb alloy, and cited Codama as describing this feature.[3] However, it is respectfully submitted that Codama clearly describes that a transition metals such as Nb of a transition metal alloy should have a total amount of ***up to*** 10 at%.[4] Amounts greater than 10 at% apparently results in too high of a resistance of the resulting thin film.[5] Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Codama cannot teach or suggest "a third layer below the second layer containing a Mo-Nb alloy, ***a content of Nb in the Mo-Nb alloy in the first layer and the third layer is between 10 and 20 atomic %,***" as defined in amended Claim 11. Consequently, amended Claim 11 (and Claims 14-18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 36, 38, and 41 dependent therefrom) are patentable over the cited references.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 36 and 38 as unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama, and further in view of Codama, it is noted that Claims 36 and 38 are dependent from Claim 11, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Codama does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Nagayama and Iyama. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 36 and 38 are patentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama and further in view of Codama.

New Claim 41 is supported at least by the specification at page 28, lines 1 to 7. As new Claim 41 is dependent from Claim 11, new Claim 41 is patentable for at least the reasons

[2]See, e.g., the specification at page 34, lines 3-12.
[3]See the outstanding Office Action at page 5, lines 3-9.
[4]See Codama, column 8, lines 39-46.
[5]See Codama, column 8, lines 46-49.

described above. Further, new Claim 41 recites subject matter that further defines over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted new Claim 41 is allowable.

New Claims 42-55 are supported at least by the pending claims and the specification at page 18, lines 1-3, page 28, lines 1-7, and page 29, lines 15-16. New Claim 42 recites in part:

> the supplementary wire comprises at least 3 layers including ***a first layer containing a Mo-V alloy*** as a surface layer, a second layer containing Al or an Al alloy formed below the surface layer, and ***a third layer below the second layer containing a Mo-V alloy***, and the second conductive layer is made of a same material as the driving current circuit connecting terminal.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references describe the use of a layer containing Mo-V alloy. In particular, column 8, lines 40-44 of Codama do not describe the use of V. Consequently, new Claim 42 (and Claims 43-45 dependent therefrom) are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\ET\252144US\252144US-AMD4.11.08.DOC